

REMARKS

Claims 24, 27, 30, 31, 52, 55, 59, and 68 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim Rejections – 35USC § 112

Claims 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants note the Examiner's comments regarding the phrase "the shoulders" in Claim 37, as lacking proper antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 37 has been amended to provide the proper antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 37- 39 under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph have been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35USC § 102

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for Claims 1-7, 10, 12-15, 17-21, 23, 26, 28, 29, 32-39, 51, 53, 54, 56-58, 60, 61, 63-66, 69, 72, and 73, said claims having been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,507,877 to Wilson. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As per Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Wilson does not teach, disclose, nor suggest that at least one of said protuberances embodies at least one interference dimension that causes the protuberance to displace a mating protuberance surface. Further, as per amended Claims 1, 23, 37, 51, and 69, Applicants respectfully submit that Wilson does not teach that at least one of the double shoulders and corresponding mating nose ends are shaped so as to substantially entrap the nose end within the shoulder to absorb shock loads due to hammering when the connected pipes are forced into the earth. In sharp contrast, the Applicants' double shoulder design allows for the shoulders/abutments and the mating nose ends to absorb the hammering impacts and thus substantially reduce or eliminate the shock loads or compressive forces on the thread surfaces. Further by having at least one shoulder and mating nose end shaped so as to substantially entrap the nose within the shoulder, the Applicants can substantially restrain the radial forces, from the hammering, from causing damage to the tubulars at the connection point.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 23, 37, 51, and 69 and Claims 2-7, 10, 12-15, 17-21, 26, 28, 29, 32-36, 38, 39, 53, 54, 56-58, 60, 61, 63-66, 72, and 73, which depend from Claims 1, 23, 37, 51, and 69 are patentable over the cited Wilson reference and a favorable condition of such claims in respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 12-15, 17-21, 23, 26, 28, 29, 32-39, 51, 54, 56-58, 60, 61, 63-66, 69, 72, and 73, said claims having been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,283,511 to Kamp. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully point out that the Examiner has misunderstood the Applicants' argument with respect to the cited Kamp reference. Applicants respectfully submit that Kamp does not teach, disclose, nor suggest the utilization of **double shoulders** mating so as to bear compressive loads to which the male and female ends are exposed during the hammering of the tubulars into the earth. Kamp only teaches a single shoulder at surfaces 7, 57. The second Kamp abutment surfaces (20/86) are not a shoulder and a mating nose end. Kamp's element 20 is an engaging tooth (see col. 6, lines 15-16) and the abutment surface 35 is formed on an axial projection of the tooth 20 (see Col. 11, lines 28-29) Kamp's element 86 is formed on a radial projection of abutment surface 85 (see Col. 11, lines 37-38). Thus, Kamp does not teach a second shoulder but instead teaches a rotational stop. Further, as per amended Claims 1, 23, 37, 51, and 69, Kamp does not teach, disclose, nor even suggest mating double shoulders nor that these shoulders bear compressive forces, as opposed to the teeth/protuberances, nor that an entrapment of nose end within a mating shoulder end restrains radial movement of the tubular, during hammering, to avoid damage to the tubular connection. Still further, per Claims 23, 37, 51, and 69 the abutment surfaces are distinct from surfaces of the threads or teeth.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 23, 37, 51, and 69 and Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 10, 12-15, 17-21, 26, 28, 29, 32-36, 38, 39, 54, 56-58, 60, 61, 63-66, 72, and 73, which depend from Claims 1, 23, 37, 51, and 69 are patentable over the cited Kamp reference and a favorable condition of such claims in respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for Claims 1, 4-6, 12, 13, 14, 37, 38, and 39, said claims having been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

4,185,856 to McCaskill. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully point out that the Examiner has misunderstood the Applicants' argument with respect to the cited McCaskill reference. McCaskill is not analogous art as it does not teach the same type of connection as Applicants'. McCaskill is a sub-sea connector which is not hammered into the earth and thus does not suggest a need for having shoulders to bear the compressive loads that otherwise must be borne by the threads or protuberances. Applicants respectfully submit that McCaskill does not teach, disclose, nor suggest the utilization of **double shoulders and corresponding nose ends** mating so as to bear compressive loads to which the male and female ends are exposed. McCaskill allegedly teaches a **single shoulder** at surfaces 62, 72. Applicants respectfully submit that rotation stops 78/90-92 are not **shoulders** as taught by Applicants. Further, McCaskill's element 92 is a movable latch that is engaged after rotation has been completed to prevent the joint from rotating in an opposite direction so as to disengage. Thus, McCaskill's element 92 is not taught to be a load bearing shoulder. Still further, per Claim 37, the abutment surfaces are distinct from the surfaces of the threads/protuberances. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, and 37 and Claims 4-6, 12, 13, 14, 38, and 39, which depend from Claims 1 and 37 are patentable over the cited McCaskill reference and a favorable condition of such claims in respectfully requested.


Therefore, neither Kamp nor McCaskill teach nor disclose a connection having double shoulders with mating nose ends. Neither Wilson, Kamp, nor McCaskill teach, disclose, nor even suggest that connected tubulars can be hammered into the earth and that the double shoulders can bear the compressive loads generated by the hammering and thus substantially prevent the compressive shock loads from being transmitted to the threads. Thus Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-7, 10, 12-15, 17-21, 23, 26, 28, 29, 32-39, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63-66, 69, 72, and 73 are patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the application now stands in *prima facie* condition for allowance and courteously request that this application be advanced to issue. The Applicants are of the opinion that no additional fees are required with the submission of this response. However, if additional fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby respectfully authorized to deduct such fees from Deposit Account

Number 13-2166. The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative, Taras P. Bemko, at 713-355-4200, to discuss any matters, that may arise, where such discussion may resolve such matters and place this application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Taras P. Bemko
Registration No. 52,609

Date: July 6, 2005
The Matthews Firm (Customer # 021897)
2000 Bering, Ste. 700
Houston, Texas 77057
(713) 355-4200 - Telephone
(713) 355-9689 - Facsimile